

exemption from the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50 previously issued to the Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD or the licensee) for the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS), located in Nemaha County, Nebraska.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revoke an exemption from the requirements of Section III.G of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50, previously issued to the licensee on September 21, 1983.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's request for withdrawal of the exemption dated December 16, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to eliminate unnecessary commitment by the licensee to upgrade certain fire barriers, which was made in connection with the exemption in question regarding the Critical Switchgear Rooms 1F and 1G on the 932 foot elevation of the reactor building.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed revocation of exemption is appropriate. The revocation of the exemption would allow the licensee to change a previous commitment to upgrade the fire barriers for the electrical bus duct penetrations in Critical Switchgear Rooms 1F and 1G. This commitment formed part of the basis upon which the staff granted the previous exemption.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the requested withdrawal of the exemption. Denial of the requested action would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Cooper Nuclear Station, dated February 1973.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 21, 1995, the staff consulted with the Nebraska State official, Ms. Julia Schmidt, Division of Radiological Health, Nebraska Department of Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's request for withdrawal of exemption dated December 16, 1994, and the exemption dated September 21, 1983, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the Commission's Local Public Document Room at the Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James R. Hall,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-20026 Filed 8-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Notice

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44907 D(1), on May 4, 1995, I notified the government of the Philippines that I had determined the Ninoy Aquino International Airport, Manila, Philippines, did not administer and maintain effective security measures. On August 2, 1995, 90 days elapsed since my determination, and I have found that Ninoy Aquino International Airport still does not administer and maintain effective security measures. My determination is based on Federal Aviation Administration assessments which reveal that security measures used at the airport do not meet the standards established by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44907 D(1), I have directed that a copy of this notice be published in the **Federal Register**, that my determination be displayed prominently in all U.S. airports regularly being served by scheduled air carrier operations, and that the news media be notified of my determination. In addition, as a result of this determination, all U.S. air carriers and foreign air carriers (and their agents) providing service between the United States and Ninoy Aquino International Airport must provide notice of my determination to any passenger purchasing a ticket for transportation between the United States and Ninoy Aquino International Airport, with such notice to be made by written material included on or with such ticket.

Dated: August 8, 1995.

Federico Peña,

Secretary of Transportation.

[FR Doc. 95-20016 Filed 8-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95-70; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban Multi-Purpose Passenger Vehicles Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban multi-purpose passenger

vehicles (MPVs) manufactured in Mexico are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs manufactured in Mexico that were not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards are eligible for importation into the United States because (1) they are substantially similar to vehicles that were originally manufactured for sale in the United States and that were certified by their manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) they are capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATES: The closing date for comments on the petition is September 13, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh St., SW, Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9:30 am to 4 pm]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202-366-5306).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 40 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115 (formerly section 114 of the Act), and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the

petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

Wallace Environmental Testing Laboratories, Inc. of Houston, Texas ("Wallace") (Registered Importer 90-005) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicles that Wallace believes are substantially similar are the 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs that were manufactured for sale in the United States and certified as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared non-U.S. certified 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs to their U.S. certified counterparts, and found the vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Wallace submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that non-U.S. certified 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs, as originally manufactured, conform to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as their U.S. certified counterparts, or are capable of being readily altered to conform to those standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that non-U.S. certified 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs are identical to their U.S. certified counterparts with respect to compliance with Standard Nos. 101 *Controls and Displays*, 102 *Transmission Shift Lever Sequence * * **, 103 *Defrosting and Defogging Systems*, 104 *Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems*, 105 *Hydraulic Brake Systems*, 106 *Brake Hoses*, 107 *Reflecting Surfaces*, 108 *Lamps, Reflective Devices and Associated Equipment*, 109 *New Pneumatic Tires*, 111 *Rearview Mirror*, 113 *Hood Latch Systems*, 114 *Theft Protection*, 115 *Vehicle Identification Number*, 116 *Brake Fluid*, 118 *Power Window Systems*, 124 *Accelerator Control Systems*, 201 *Occupant Protection in Interior Impact*, 202 *Head Restraints*, 203 *Impact Protection for the Driver From the Steering Control System*, 204 *Steering Control Rearward Displacement*, 205 *Glazing Materials*, 206 *Door Locks and Door Retention Components*, 207 *Seating Systems*, 209 *Seat Belt Assemblies*, 210 *Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages*, 211 *Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs and Hubcaps*, 212 *Windshield Retention*, 214 *Side Impact Protection*, 216 *Roof Crush Resistance*,

219 *Windshield Zone Intrusion*, 301 *Fuel System Integrity*, and 302 *Flammability of Interior Materials*.

Additionally, the petitioner states that non-U.S. certified 1992, 1993, and 1994 General Motors Suburban MPVs comply with the Bumper Standard found in 49 CFR Part 581.

Petitioner also contends that the vehicles are capable of being readily altered to meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 120 *Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles other than Passenger Cars*: installation of a tire information placard.

Standards No. 208 *Occupant Crash Protection*: installation of Type 2 lap and shoulder belts at each outboard seating position and a Type 1 lap belt at the center seating position on the rear passenger seat. The petitioner stated that the vehicles are equipped with Type 2 lap and shoulder belts at each outboard seating position on the front and middle passenger seats, and with a Type 1 lap belt in the center seating position on the middle passenger seat.

Interested persons are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered. Notice of final action on the petition will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8: delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on: August 9, 1995.

Marilynne Jacobs,

Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95-20022 Filed 8-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-P